



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of the indifferent Stendhal. We have little or nothing about the real Ossianic cycle, if indeed that has figured in French letters. It has been suggested that we have too little with regard to the probable influence of the "Revelation" on the theory of the epic.<sup>12</sup> There are, in fact, hints in this connection—concerning the wane of the *épopée*, the new *merveilleux*, and even the beginning of the Wolfian theory—which might well be worked up into a study of Ossian and the epic. The Index, of proper names only, omits various journals and other titles that one would like to find. The classified bibliography<sup>13</sup> shows confusion and overlapping in several of its divisions. It seems sufficiently comprehensive, though not so monumental as that accompanying Professor Baldensperger's *Goethe en France*. As compared with M. Estève's *Byron et le Romantisme français*, the present work, to my mind, lacks a certain grandeur of appeal; but that may well be due to the difference of subject. Certainly Dr. Van Tieghem's able volumes present a very convincing harmony of science and art. .

E. PRESTON DARGAN.

*University of Chicago.*

---

*Living French.* By RICHARD T. HOLBROOK. Boston, Ginn and Company, 1917. xvii + 480 pp.

Mr. Holbrook has more than once had occasion to express his views on the editing of text-books to be used in the teaching of French,<sup>1</sup> and it is naturally these views which have determined the general character and special features of the book before us. In the first place, this grammar will dispel any delusion its readers may have entertained as to French being "an easy subject." In the second place, it marks a distinct advance over the average type of French grammar in that, as the title indicates, French is treated as a living language, the spoken form of which is no less important than its written form. The author's attitude throughout is that of an observer and recorder of actual phenomena, rather than that of

<sup>12</sup> I am indebted to Prof. W. A. Nitze for this suggestion.

<sup>13</sup> II, 477-519.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *MLN*, xxx, 223-227; *Mod. Lang. Journal*, I, 18-32.

a legislator. Mr. H.'s recognition of the principles of modern linguistic science, his scrupulous accuracy, and above all his thorough familiarity with French usage, have admirably equipped him for this work.

Part I consists of an "Introductory Survey," devoted mainly to the pronunciation of French, and 77 "Lessons" of 4 pages each. The arrangement of the material in the individual lessons varies greatly from one lesson to another. A noteworthy feature is the absence of special vocabularies in each lesson, and meaningless paradigms are to a large extent replaced by phrases which present the forms in a reasonable context. Part II comprises (a) a thorough treatment of the forms (oral and written) of typical French verbs, with occasional additional facts as to the syntax of the verb, (b) details concerning the gender and number of nouns, (c) an English-French Vocabulary, (d) a French-English Vocabulary, and (e) a General Index.

Many of the lessons include connected passages in French, of varying length and drawn from a wide range of sources, from Gaston Paris to Alfred Capus.<sup>2</sup> These selections from real French, for the most part judiciously chosen and worth while for their own sake, are on the whole better than the usual made-to-order "reading-exercise." The shorter examples are in general intended to illustrate "the usage of unaffected conversation and of unaffected writing." This does not mean that literary usage is slighted. It merely means (and this is one of the most important features of the book), that the author has throughout taken the greatest care, in commenting upon his examples, to distinguish between different kinds of style and usage, to characterize his examples as "bookish," "colloquial," "jocular," "not living French," etc.

In a number of instances, the desire to force the use of a certain French construction or the effort to cram too much into too small a space, has resulted in sentences which are amorphous or at least decidedly un-English, and sometimes quite unintelligible. *E. g.* § 143, 1, 8: "And was the henhouse behind which this fox was accustomed to prowl near the house where that dog's master

<sup>2</sup> In many cases, the source should be indicated more exactly. This applies particularly to titles which are quoted without mention of the author's name.

lived?"<sup>3</sup> Of doubtful pedagogic value are a few exercises in which the student is to correct faulty French sentences.

Mr. H. lays especial stress on correct pronunciation. The first few paragraphs define the field of grammar, explain briefly but accurately and in an interesting manner the physiological facts necessary for an elementary understanding of phonetics, and establish a summary classification of speech-sounds. The author draws instructive comparisons between French and English sounds and suggests a number of simple experiments. As particularly commendable I may mention the clear and simple description of the nasal vowels (§ 10) and the accurate definition of the term "syllable" (§ 27). Mr. H. assumes that the Standard French *r* is the uvular [R], but I question the advisability of insisting on it for those students who find it very difficult, as a good [r] is better than a bad [R].<sup>4</sup> The statement in regard to the emotional shift of accent (§ 25, *e*) is not quite exact: "Emotional words may become paroxytonic, seldom proparoxytonic." The general tendency in such cases is to shift the stress to the first syllable (regardless of the number of syllables), or to the second syllable if the word begins with a vowel.<sup>5</sup> The only serious omission in the treatment of pronunciation is the failure, in speaking of liaison (§ 31), to mention the linking of *-d*.

For words or groups in regard to which usage hesitates or authorities differ, Mr. H. generally follows the pronunciation preferred by Martinon. So, § 24, *a*, and *passim*: *aujourd'hui* [o-]; § 31, *c* (also §§ 87, II; 354, *h*): *à neuf heures* [anøvce:R]; § 87, *v* (and § 469): *je sais* [sɛ]; § 96, l. 10: *rez-de-chaussée* [Rɛ]; § 174, *N.*: *âge* [a:ʒ].—Very doubtful is the progressive assimilation indicated for the linking after *êtes*: [vuze:t(s)] (§ 42; cf. also § 54, *b*: [pøtitsami]; § 64: [paRlat(s)]; § 177, *a*: [mè:tsokazjō]). The inverse phenomenon (regressive assimilation) is of course constant in French (as indicated in § 48, l. 3 for *subtil* [syptil]).—I know of no authority for the following pronunciations: § 9, *b*: *château*

<sup>3</sup> Similarly § 96, III, 2; § 102, II, 4; § 106, I, 2; § 130, II, 1; § 143, I, 3, 7; § 146, I, 10; § 160, III, 7; § 226, II, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Since the "glottal (?) *r*" is mentioned (§ 16), it should be described. Passy (*Petite phonétique comparée*, § 223) describes this sound as a voiced uvular fricative. In this review [R] has been used for [R].

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Passy, l. c., §§ 85-88, and Martinon, *Comment on prononce le français*, p. 10.

[ʃà·to] <sup>6</sup>; § 11, *b*: *pays* [pèi] (indicated as an alternative pronunciation)<sup>7</sup>; § 29, *c*, (and elsewhere): *chien* [ʃɛ̃]; § 158, 2: *essuiera* [èsy]əi·j(Ra) and *essuie-s* [èsyi(:)j] (alternative pronunciations).<sup>8</sup>—§ 219, *B*: *craignons* [kRɛ̃·pɔ̃]. If so, the example which follows (*Nous craignons qu'il n'éteigne la lumière*) would be quite ambiguous. Cf. also §§ 158, *a*; 397, N. 2 and f.-n.; 469, *L. S.* In denying that in normal speech there is any difference between *-ions*, *-iez* and *-ons*, *-ez*, after stems which end in a palatal consonant, Mr. H. follows the authority of Clédât (*Grammaire raisonnée*, §§ 93, 373). Martinon, however, who is surely a no less competent observer of phonetic phenomena, insists (pp. 189-190, 268) that there is a difference.—For *obus* (§ 331, iv, 9, and p. 429), the usual military pronunciation [oby] <sup>9</sup> is preferable to the one indicated: [by:z].—§ 403, *c*: “Note that *coûte-t-il* = [kutɔ̃til], and that *vendent-ils* = [vā:dɔ̃til].” Not ordinarily.<sup>10</sup> In such cases there is a slight pause between the implosion and the explosion, but normally no [ə] is heard (except of course in poetical diction). The same remark applies to *chante-t-on* (§ 403, *g*), *battent-ils* (§ 444), which are similarly transcribed.—§§ 452-453: *boire, je bois* [bwa:R bwa], *croire, crois* [kRwa:R kRwa]. In spite of Nyrop<sup>11</sup> and others, neither Rousselot-Laclotte nor Martinon distinguish between the vowels of *boire* and *croire*, *bois* and *crois*. Rousselot and Laclotte give both *boire* and *croire* with “*à*” (= [a], p. 130), both *bois* and *crois* with “*a moyen*” (p. 136). According to Martinon (p. 46), “*oi* final n’est ni long ni fermé, sans être tout à fait bref, ni tout à fait ouvert, et cela avec ou sans consonne indifféremment, et après un *r*, aussi bien qu’après une consonne quelconque” (for the infinitives, cf. Martinon, p. 48, top). Mr. H. himself elsewhere (§ 41, l. 6) transcribes [kRwa:R]. For *croître, crois* ([kRwa:tR, or rather kRwa:tR kRwa] according to Mr. H., § 460, *d*), cf. Rousselot-Laclotte, p. 138, and Martinon, p. 48. The passage just quoted from Martinon applies also to *trois* ([tRwa] according to Mr. H., § 20 and elsewhere), in which Rousselot and Laclotte hear “*á*” (= [a], p. 136).—§ 478: “*faisant* [fɛzā or fəzā],” etc. The former pronunciation is not to be recommended.<sup>12</sup> The following are evidently either misprints or slips: § 132, *d*: “*il*

<sup>6</sup> Michaelis-Passy, Rousselot-Laclotte (*Précis*, pp. 109, 148), Martinon (p. 33) all give the first vowel as [a].

<sup>7</sup> None of the authorities referred to in the preceding note allow the diphthongal pronunciation (cf. Rousselot-Laclotte, p. 153; Martinon, p. 190).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Martinon, pp. 163, 193.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Rousselot-Laclotte, pp. 150, 168; Martinon, pp. 110, 305-306.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Martinon, p. 165.

<sup>11</sup> *Manuel phonétique du français parlé*, § 238.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Martinon, p. 86.

*hait* [e or he] " (the correct pronunciation [ɛ or hɛ] is indicated in § 432); § 161, l. 16: "[da:ʒe]" for [dā:ʒe]; § 479: "[Rije]" for [Riɛ].—§ 102, l. 9: "*Chut!*" The pronunciation ([ʃ:t]), should be indicated. Likewise the liaison in *les yeux* (§ 143, b).

The author's scientific attitude in dealing with the facts of grammar has already been noted. He does not hesitate, when it is necessary, to abandon the traditions of the older grammarians and base his statements upon actual usage. Particularly illuminating is the frequent emphasis laid on archaisms of form and syntax—relics of an older usage contrasted with examples illustrating a modern tendency. Mr. H. consistently endeavors to distinguish between forms and their functions. This principle finds its application notably in the case of the verb. Here the old tense-names are abandoned and replaced by symbols which serve merely to identify forms, regardless of their functions. Thus (*il*) *dit* is 3 *A* or 3. *C* of *dire*, *auraient* is 6 *E* of *avoir*, *eût mis* is 3 *O. S. p. p.* of *mettre*, etc. Grotesque as this system may at first appear, it undoubtedly makes for exactness and one soon becomes accustomed to it. Distinctly original, too, is Mr. H.'s systematic treatment of the verb from the formal point of view. He rejects the traditional categories of regular and irregular verbs. For him a verb is "regular" when it is "complete (not defective), when there is no marked variation in the spelling or the sound of the stem, and when its inflectional endings agree throughout with those of the type to which we have agreed to assign it." Thus *parler* is regular but *aimer* is not. The "types" are grouped "with respect to their general resemblances," and these tables are supplemented by a "Special Index of Verb-Types and of Odd Forms." Particularly commendable is the exposition of the following difficult matters: the functions of the imperfect and past definite tenses, the conditional as tense and mood, verb-forms in *-ant*, personal pronouns, the position of descriptive adjectives.

Both the vocabularies contain abundant references to examples and explanations. Noteworthy is the systematic arrangement under the various words in the French-English vocabulary (cf. for example the column and a half of well-classified examples and meanings under *de*). Though I have not verified all the references, the vocabularies seem reasonably complete and accurate; unfortunately the same cannot be said of the General Index, which is

incomplete and quite unsystematic in its arrangement.<sup>13</sup> The following details likewise deserve mention:

§ 6: "nu(i)t," "tu(é)," "ou(i)." Why ()?—§ 40. Is it exact to say that *est-ce que* is "a shortened form of *Est-ce vrai que*"? (Cf. Tobler, *VB*, II<sup>2</sup>, p. 7). Again, in examples 3, 4, under § 78, how can we "derive" *c'est que* from *c'est vrai que*?—§ 42. Read "[nu som(z)]."—§ 43, 1. In several of these sentences, the student will hardly know whether to use the generic article or the partitive.—§ 43, IV, v. For "43, c" read "43, b," and for "43, b" read "43, a."—§ 46, Exercise, 4. The proper form for "your" has not been given.—§ 52, 1. 6. Read "Some."—§ 55, a. The distinction between *aussi . . . que* and *comme* should be indicated. Otherwise the student might render e. g. § 58, 1, 10: "*Les livres sont-ils utiles comme la nourriture?*," or § 102, Oral, 3: "*. . . elle est aussi sourde qu'un pot.*"—§ 56. "but only with *le*" is not clear.—§ 64. Read "[paRlɛ:R(t)]."—§ 73, a, N. 3: "*chic(s)*" (?).—P. 69 (last line). For "about" read "before."—§ 75, 1: "*sur les six* = 'about six'." This dubious locution occurs again in §§ 327, f (also "*sur les une*"), and 354, h.—§ 75, v, 4, 6. The student, having had no examples of the name of a language as subject or predicate nominative, will not know that the definite article must be used in these cases.—§ 76. It seems to me doubtful whether in e. g. "*C'est votre frère*" the substantive should be regarded as "the true subject." On the other hand, in "*C'est ici le lieu de préciser*" (§ 80), Mr. H. terms *le lieu de préciser* a "predicate substantive." Neither in this Lesson nor elsewhere does the author adequately explain certain cases in which the student will be perplexed in choosing between *ce* and *il* (*elle* etc.) as subject of *être*.<sup>14</sup>—§ 80. "*c'est là son moindre défaut*" means: "If she has faults, that is

<sup>13</sup> "où" appears, but not "dont"; "par," "sans," but not "pour"; "will" and "would," but neither "shall" nor "should"; "Imperfect" but not "Pluperfect"; etc. Under "Pronouns," we find "demonstrative," "indefinite," "interrogative," "personal," "relative" (with references after each); most of these appear separately (under "Demonstrative," etc.), but in many cases with different references. Still other references are given under "*ce*," "*celui*," "*qui*," etc. Under "Relative pronouns" there is a reference to "Pronouns"; not so under "Demonstrative," etc. In the case of articles which include numerous references, there should be suitable sub-headings. As it is, if the student wishes enlightenment on some point regarding the use of the preposition *de*, he may have to plow through some two dozen references (under "*de*, meanings and syntax"), before he finds what he wants. Almost the only article under which suitable sub-headings occur is "Archaisms."

<sup>14</sup> This matter is fairly well presented in Alexander's *Practical Introduction to French*, §§ 66, 111-112; cf. also Spiers in *MLN*, xxviii, 116.

surely not one of them." Mr. H.'s rendering ("that is the least of her faults") has a quite different connotation (implying: "she has other worse faults").—§§ 81, 82. Refer to § 75.—§ 83, 9. Referring to sentence 6, the student will again say "*se combine*."—§ 83, 16. Refer to § 86, *b*, N.—§ 89. This use of the future is limited (cf. Armstrong,<sup>15</sup> § 29, 2).—§ 101, l. 10. Read "*ruissellerait*." Why "would" in l. 4, but "should" in l. 11? The fact is that such a passage would never occur in normal English.—§ 110. For "§§ 108-109" read "§ 108."—§ 111, ex. 1. For "*a eu été sorti*" read "*a été sorti*." Or is this a form of *A 3 p. p.* (a group not otherwise mentioned)?—§ 112, 1. Referring to "§ 85 and Note *b*," the student will be led to say "*parle de Chine*." The reference should have been rather to § 333, *b*.—§ 114 (p. 100, l. 3). Read "*Qu'est-ce*."—§ 118: "*Dont*, meaning 'whose,' may precede *le* (*la*, *les*) + noun, but only thus." Meaning? What the student needs to be told is the proper form to use when the thing possessed is object of a preposition.—§ 123, *a*, R. Such attraction is also frequent after clauses which are not negated.—§ 134: "*Qui ne dit mot consent*." The student should be warned that this is an archaism, otherwise he may attempt to form new sentences on the same model. Likewise in § 133: "*qui plus est*."—§ 135: "*Qui riait, qui pleurait*." Living French?—§ 136, *a*, N. Cf. Godefroy for OFr. examples of *bal* (including the old plural *baus*). Is it not an exaggeration to say that *bal* is "very seldom plural" (cf. *les bals de l'Opéra*)?—§ 140, ex. 3: "*Il n'y a pas de quoi*." The ellipsis would be clearer if "*(me remercier)*" were added.—§ 142: "*Now, où* can have as its antecedent only common nouns expressing situation." Misleading (cf. *Paris, où . . .*).—§ 144: "All forms of the relative pronouns, . . ." etc. But the six examples in this paragraph illustrate only *qui*.—§ 146: "It [*que*] cannot be used as a subject, . . ." etc. This statement is immediately contradicted at the top of p. 116 and in § 147, *a*, N.—§ 151. In "*Je ne sais quoi imiter*," *quoi* is used not, as Mr. H. says, "because *imiter* begins with a vowel," but rather because *imiter* may also be used absolutely.—§ 156. The exclamatory *comme* (cf. § 193, l. 29) should also be mentioned and distinguished from *comment*.—§ 176, 11, 9. Is the student to say "*peuvent sembler ressembler*"?—§ 181. Mention several other common uses of *tel* (*telle et telle chose, tel quel, Monsieur un tel*).—§ 181, *a*, ex. 2: "*Tel homme, tel maître*." The usual expression is "*Tel maître, tel valet*." Ex. 3 should not appear under the heading "*Tel . . . tel . . .*"—§ 182, *a*: "*Tout, tous*, etc. show approximately the same constructions as 'all' and 'every'; not as 'whole'." Rather puzzling for the student.—§ 182, *c*, 4. In "*pas du tout*," does *tout* "stand alone"?—§ 187 (top p. 152). For "*D p. p.*" read "*E p. p.*"—§ 187, *a*. For an-

<sup>15</sup> *Syntax of the French Verb*.



other meaning of *devoir* + *de* + infinitive, cf. Armstrong, § 66, 4 (4) a.—§ 188, III: “noting carefully that the auxiliary must be *être* in all reflexive constructions, and that the past participle must agree in gender and number with the subject.” (Cf. *Elles se sont dit que*. . . .) A similarly misleading statement occurs in § 265, e. It is true that § 269, exs. 7, 8 (also § 283, c, ex. 2, and § 427, a, exs. 6, 7) illustrate the form of the past participle when the reflexive pronoun is indirect object, but this type of sentence is nowhere clearly explained.—§ 188, Exercise II, 7. Refer to § 332.—P. 155, f.-n.: “the so-called ‘Second Conjugation,’ exemplified by *devoir*,” etc. Confusion worse confounded!—§ 198. Include here the enclitic datives.—§ 202: “In *avoir*, *être*, *pouvoir*, *savoir*, and *vouloir* only subjunctive forms are used to express a command, request, or wish.” Entirely misleading as applied to such forms as *sachons*, *veuillez*, which are not subjunctive forms in present-day French. The forms given under *b* (*puisses-tu*, etc.) are real subjunctives, and 1, 3, 4 are not analogous to the corresponding forms in *a*, *c*, *d*, *e*. Confusion would be avoided if all 3d person “imperatives” were regarded as subjunctives. Why in fact classify as “imperatives” *Qu’elle parle* (§ 194), *Dieu m’en garde* (§ 194, e), and as “subjunctives” *Qu’elle se taise* (§ 213), *Dieu vous bénisse* (§ 213, b)? —§ 202, e, 1. Read “*Veuille me dire*.”—§ 209. Perhaps too strong a statement in regard to the imperfect subjunctive. A few monosyllabic 3d person singular forms are still used in spoken French.—§ 215. Mention the possibility in some of these cases, of using *de ce que* with the indicative.—§ 215, 1, 2. Read “*ne* + *vb.* + *qu’une*.” —§ 215, 1, 3. “*L. S.* + *forcé à*” is not clear (*L. S.* of what verb?). Better say “*forcer à*, *L. S. p. p.*”—§ 222, IV, 1. Read “§ 188, III.” —§ 225, IV. State that *ne* alone (no *pas*) is to be used in the dependent clause.—§ 226, I, 1. “Where is the book that contains no ideas that we haven’t met already, somewhere?” (is this what Mr. H. really means to say?) should be followed by a reference to § 368, j.—§ 227, a, R.: “*C’en est le meilleur, que je sache*.” Very doubtful (cf. Armstrong, § 55, 1, d, and E. Rigal in *RLR*, XIX, p. 299).—§ 228, R. h. “*Tout* (variable)” needs to be qualified (cf. § 363).—§ 228, 1, 4. *Si peu que* would be used here rather than *pour peu que*, as the latter implies a condition (“if . . . a little”) rather than a pure concession (cf. § 249, 1. 3 and N. 3), and might, in fact, better be classed under § 230.—§ 229, b, Q.: “*Quoi qu’il leur arrivât, ils ne canaient jamais*.” An unlikely combination (with “*O. S.*” in the first clause, and in the second a trivial verb like *caner*).—§ 230. Mention *à condition que* (often with the indicative).—§ 236. The colloquial equivalent would be rather: “*Si vous intentiez . . .*” (condition, not concession).—§ 244, ex. 7. Explain this use of the reflexive, or refer to § 301, R.—§ 254, N. 16. An improbable etymology (cf. *NED*, s. v. “rut”).—§ 255, b. The use of the term “impersonal verb” in these cases is questionable (cf. Armstrong, §§ 20-21).—§ 258, c, N. Read

“§§ 260 ff.”—P. 226 (end of 1). Read “I hope.”—§ 264, 2: “*les savants* (no feminine).” Inexact (cf. Littré).—§ 266, l. 8. Read “[§ 98].”—§ 267, *b*. Since there is no verb *âger*, why consider *âgé* a past participle (any more than *e. g. barbelé*)?—§ 268, *b*, N. A past participle preceded by *combien* + *en* may vary for the eye (cf. Clédât, *Gram. rais.*, § 432).—§ 271, R.: “*Il y avait six hommes tués*, rather than . . . *de tués*.” Not necessarily. There may be a difference of meaning: *de* + the participle implies other individuals to which the state indicated by the participle does not apply (cf. Clédât in *RPhF*, xv, pp. 120-127, and Tobler, *VB*, III<sup>2</sup>, No. 5, *ad fin.*).—§ 276, *b*: “*Vous l’avez manquée belle*.” Whether logically or illogically (cf. Clédât, *G. r.*, § 425), the past participle is commonly neutral (*manqué*).—§ 277, 11. Refer to § 244, ex. 7.—§ 278, *a*. Add that what is true of *les* is true also of *la*.—§ 302, *b* (4): “*Il faisait nuit*” means rather “It was dark”; “It was getting dark” = *Il se faisait nuit*. Also “*Il fait soleil*” is less common than *Il fait du soleil*.—§ 314, *b*, R. Refer to § 312, *b*.—§ 315, 1, ll. 13-14. The phrase from *Colomba* is inaccurately quoted (cf. Mr. Schinz’s edition, p. 114).—§ 327, *c*, R.: “*le Quatorze Juillet*.” In regard to capitalization in this case, usage hesitates. *E. g.*, in the *Nouvelles de France* for July 19, 1917, the name of the national holiday is not capitalized, while in several following issues, it is.—§ 328, *a*. Add that in giving “speed per hour,” *à l’heure* is used (*une vitesse de 150 km. à l’heure*).—§ 333, N. 3: “but we must say . . . *l’empereur de la Chine*.” An overstatement (cf. *Dict. gén.*, s. v. *empereur*, and Clédât, *G. r.*, § 201, *b*).—§ 337, II, III. On these cases, cf. Clédât, *G. r.*, §§ 198, 201, *a*. In many of them, usage is quite uncertain, but Mr. H. errs rather in allowing an excessive freedom of choice. It would be better to indicate certain constructions as normal (*e. g.*, *aller au Canada, en Danemark*), and mention the less usual forms as possibilities.—§ 338, *f*. The masc. sing. *vieux* is not infrequent before a noun beginning with a vowel or mute *h*.—§ 340, *a*, N. *J’ai un jour de libre* is not necessarily “bad French” (cf. my comment on § 271, R.).—§ 353, *a*, R.: “*cent (et) un-e*.” *Cent et un* is so rare as to be negligible. More to the point would have been some mention of *soixante et dix*, which is quite common. Finally *soixante et onze* is more usual than *soixante-onze* (cf. p. 315).—§ 353, *b*. The statement as to the variability of *cent* is inadequate (but cf. § 355, 1, 4, and § 359).—P. 315, f.-n. Though less common than “*dix-neuf cent dix-huit*,” etc., *mil neuf cent* . . . should by no means be ruled out entirely.—§ 356, *a*, 2: “en 1900 [*read dix-neuf cents*].” Better “*dix-neuf cent*.”—§ 356, *b*. The official division of the day into 24 hours (1-24) should at least be mentioned. Under this system, “12 o’clock” may be *douze heures* (cf. Exercise III, 1).—§ 357. Mention the use of the definite article in such cases as *les trois quarts du temps*.—§ 363. “*toute étonnée*” is unusual.—§ 364, *a*. It is inexact to say that “*nouveau venu*” has no feminine (cf. *Dict. gén.*,

s. v. *nouveau*, and Clédât, *G. r.*, § 250).—§ 370, *g*, N. Colloquially, *ce n'est pas rien* is not uncommon (= *c'est quelque chose*). For analogous *ne . . . pas que*, cf. § 378, *a*, N. 4.—§ 374, *d*: “*Rien* may be followed by *qui*, *quoi*, *de quoi* (*à quoi* etc.), and by *dont*.” Under what circumstances by *quoi*? The list should include *que*.—§ 387, *c*. For “§§ 218-219” read “§§ 216, 219.” Make the same correction in § 400 (under “*peindre*”), and in § 403, *a*.—P. 349, f.-n. 2. Quotation should end after “*s'imposer*.”—§ 397, *a* (4), ex. 6: “he fell stricken by a bomb.” Not living English.—§ 399, *c*, N. For “202” read “204” (?).—§ 404, *a*, *b*. Cf. my comment on § 202.—§ 408, *b* (p. 363, l. 5). For “5 *D p. p.*” read “5 *E p. p.*”—§ 422: “*Épousseter* (commonly [?] written *épouster*).”—§ 424, *a*. French grammarians do not generally restrict the term “*verbes pronominaux*” to the “essential reflexives.”—P. 369, f.-n. 4. Not always (cf. *Dict. gén.*, s. v. *partir* II, 1°).—§ 428. For “*allé-s*” read “*allé-e*” (cf. § 405, N.).—§ 443 (p. 375, l. 6). Read “399, *b.*”—§ 461. For “399, *c*” read “339, *b.*”—§ 470, *C*.—Read “398, *c.*”—§ 470, *b*. Add examples such as *il le faut*, *il me les faut*.—§ 487, *a*. Though rare, *peintresse* and *poétesse* exist.—§ 490: “*enseigne*.” After “standard-bearer,” add the modern meaning “ensign.”—§ 492. For “*poign*” read “*poing*.”—§ 492, *k*, N. “*souillon*” may be masculine.—§ 497, *b*, N. The generally authorized plural is *des reines-Claude*.—§ 497, *d*, N.: “*Plate-forme* has only *plate-formes*.” What authority? Likewise, under *f*, what authority for “*des croc-en-jambe*”?—P. 406: “*amount vb.*” Add “370, ex. 15.”—P. 408: “*be*.” Under (*g*), read “275.”—“*between*.” For “302” read “304” (?).—P. 409: “*born, be*.” Read “ex. 4.”—“*by*.” Strike out “§ 243, ex. 3.”—P. 412: “*eager to, be (very) avoir (grande, or grand) envie de*.” What authority for “*grand*”?—P. 413: “*fact*.” The reference “§ 98, R,” here inapplicable, should follow “*face*” (just above).—P. 416: “*glad . . . see happy*.” The latter word does not appear.—P. 433: “*the (1)*.” The reference to “§ 311” is inapplicable.—P. 441, N. 4. For “33” read “35.”—P. 443. Add “*argot*” (cf. § 87, Additional Exercise).—P. 444: “*c*.” Read “*ç'aurait*.”—P. 445: “*Champagne*.” For “497” read “493” (?).—P. 450: “*endroit*.” For “320” read “330.” Make the same correction under “*envers*” (p. 451), “*être*” (p. 451), “*fut*” (p. 453).—P. 452: “*extrêmement*.” Read “*extreme-ly*.”—Add “*fait, en fait de*” (cf. § 315, I, l. 4).—P. 458: “*mil* occurs in *l'an mil* (A. D. 1000) etc.” Inexact or misleading.—P. 464: “*punir*.” For “305” read “303.”—P. 465: “*regarder*.” Add the meaning “concern” (cf. § 54, VI).—P. 473: “*Article, Definite*.” Add “§§ 37, 58.”—P. 474: “*C p. p.*” For “§ 106, *a*” read “§§ 103-106, 110.” Why not under “*Tenses*”?—“*ce*,” etc. Add “§§ 68, 314, *b*,” and for “83” read “76-83,” or refer to “*Demonstrative*,” etc.—“*celui*.” Add § 75.—“*ci*.” Add “§§ 80-82.”—“*Conditions*.” For “R” read “N.”—“*Conjugations*.” Add “§ 189.”—P. 476: “*Indirect questions*.”

For "233" read "223."—"Linking." For "143, b" read "143, c," and add "§ 497, b, c, f, g."—"Logical" etc. Before "265," add "§ 76."—P. 478: "Partitives." Add "§ 38, a."—"Past definite." Refer to "Tenses."—"Petite phonétique comparée." Add "p. 26 (footnote)."—"plus." Strike out "§ 267, c," and add "§§ 55-56, 90, 375."—P. 479: "sembler." For "233" read "223."—"Stress." Add "§ 43, c."—"Tenses." Under "present tense" add "§ 192." Under "group B" add "§§ 67, 192." Under "groups D and E," for "84-112" read "84-102, 107-110," and strike out (as inapplicable to groups D, E) "192, 242, 251, a, ex. 3, 267, a." References to the compound tenses are quite inadequate: in addition to §§ 72-73, refer also to §§ 103-106, 110-112, 427.—This list of corrections in the Index is by no means complete.

I have tried to make clear the fact that, in spite of minor defects (which, for the most part, can easily be remedied), *Living French* is a book that will stand out among French grammars as a work of prime importance. As it differs so radically from most books of similar scope, I prefer to reserve a judgment concerning its adaptability for the classroom until I shall have had an opportunity to test it in actual use. It is however my impression that with college students, certainly with those of more than average ability, its success will be assured. By no means negligible will be its undoubted value as a book of reference for teachers, especially for those who have been denied an adequate opportunity for first-hand acquaintance with living French. Let us hope that, in a second edition, the value of the book from this point of view will be enhanced by the addition of a *satisfactory* index.

PERCIVAL B. FAY.

*University of California.*

---

*A Study of English and American Writers, Volume III, A Laboratory Method*, by J. SCOTT CLARK, with additions by JOHN PRICE ODELL. Chicago: Row, Peterson & Co., 1916.

This volume supplements Professor Clark's *Study of English Prose Writers*, 1898, and his *Study of English and American Poets*, 1900. It differs from these two, as stated in its preface, "not in quality, but in quantity; . . . more authors have been given place . . .; biographical outlines, bibliographies, critical comments,